

BÖLÜM 7

İMLANT DESTEKLİ TAM ARK SABİT PROTEZLERDE FOTOGARAMETRİ

Elif YİĞİT¹

Bilgisayar bilimindeki en son gelişmeler sayesinde dijital teknolojiler, diş hekimliği uygulamalarına geniş ölçüde entegre edilmiştir. Hastalara ait fotoğraflar, radyografiler, anamnez bilgileri ve dental modellerin fiziksel olarak saklanması gerek kalmamış; bunun yerine elektronik ortamlarda depolanarak kliniklerde yer tasarrufu sağlanmış ve bilgilere hızlı bir biçimde erişim imkânı elde edilmiştir (1).

Dijital dental modeller ile alçı modellerin lineer ölçümlerini karşılaştırmaya yönelik birçok çalışma yapılmış ve bu çalışmalar her iki yöntem arasında istatistiksel olarak benzer sonuçlar elde edildiğini göstermiştir (2,3). Ancak, bu çalışmaların büyük bir kısmında dijital dental modellerin elde edilmesinde fotogrametri bir ölçüm yöntemi olarak dikkate alınmamıştır.

American Society of Photogrammetry and Remote Sensing (ASPRS) fotogrametriyi, “fiziksel nesneler ve çevre hakkında güvenilir bilgilerin, temassız sensör sistemlerinden elde edilen görüntülerin ve enerji örüntülerinin kaydedilmesi, ölçülmesi ve yorumlanması süreci aracılığıyla elde edilmesine yönelik sanat, bilim ve teknoloji” olarak tanımlamaktadır (4) . Fotogrametri, küçük nesnelerin boyut ve şekil açısından orijinal nesneye benzer şekilde üç boyutlu modellere dönüştürülmesinde etkili bir yöntem olabilmektedir (5). Diş hekimliği ve maksillofasiyal alanlarda ise bu veri elde etme yöntemi; alçı modellerden dijital dental modellerin oluşturulmasında, fasiyal asimetrisinin değerlendirilmesinde ve ortognatik cerrahinin planlanmasında , ayrıca ortodonti ve dentofasiyal ortopedide tanı, vaka analizleri ve yumuşak doku ölçümlerinde yararlı olabilmektedir (6,7).

İmlant Destekli Protezlerde Pasif Uyum

İmlant destekli tam ark sabit protezlerde pasif uyum, fonksiyonel yük uygulanmadan önce tüm yüzeylerin eşzamanlı ve sürekli olarak gerilimsiz temas etme-

¹ Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, Kırıkkale Üniversitesi Diş Hekimliği Fakültesi Protetik Diş Tedavisi AD., elifyigit3@gmail.com, ORCID iD: 0000-0003-3256-062X

KAYNAKLAR

1. Akyalcin S. Are digital models replacing plaster casts. *Dentistry*. 2011;1(2):1–2.
2. Fleming PS, Marinho V, Johal A. Orthodontic measurements on digital study models compared with plaster models: a systematic review. *Orthod Craniofac Res*. 2011;14(1):1–16.
3. Santoro M, Galkin S, Teredesai M, Nicolay OF, Cangialosi TJ. Comparison of measurements made on digital and plaster models. *Am J Orthod Dentofac Orthop*. 2003;124(1):101–5.
4. Zotti F, Rosolin L, Bersani M, Poscolere A, Pappalardo D, Zerman N. Digital dental models: is photogrammetry an alternative to dental extraoral and intraoral scanners? *Dent J*. 2022;10(2):24.
5. Evgenikou V, Georgopoulos A. Investigating 3D reconstruction methods for small artifacts. *Int Arch Photogramm Remote Sens Spat Inf Sci*. 2015;40:101–8.
6. Silvester CM, Hillson S. A critical assessment of the potential for structure-from-motion photogrammetry to produce high fidelity 3D dental models. *Am J Phys Anthropol*. 2020;173(2):381–92.
7. Da Pozzo F, Gibelli D, Beltramini GA, Dolci C, Gianni AB, Sforza C. The effect of orthognathic surgery on soft-tissue facial asymmetry: a longitudinal three-dimensional analysis. *J Craniofac Surg*. 2020;31(6):1578–82.
8. Moreno A, Giménez B, Özcan M, Pradies G. A clinical protocol for intraoral digital impression of screw-retained CAD/CAM framework on multiple implants based on wavefront sampling technology. *Implant Dent*. 2013;22(4):320–5.
9. Ribeiro P, Díaz-Castro CM, Ríos-Carrasco B, Ríos-Santos JV, Herrero-Climent M. Stereo-photogrammetry for impression of full-arch fixed dental prosthesis—an update of the reviews. *Prosthesis*. 2024;6(4):939–51.
10. GOMES J, DE MORAES S, SANTIAGO JÚNIOR J, LEMOS C, PELLIZZER E. Evaluation of marginal misfit of implant-supported fixed prostheses made using different techniques. *Int J Prosthodont*. 2019;
11. Branemark P-I. Osseointegrated implants in the treatment of the edentulous jaw: experience from a 10-year period. *Scad J Plast Reconstr Surg*. 1977;16:1–132.
12. Jemt T, Lie A. Accuracy of implant-supported prostheses in the edentulous jaw. Analysis of precision of fit between cast gold-alloy frameworks and master casts by means of a three-dimensional photogrammetric technique. *Clin Oral Implants Res*. 1995;6(3):172–80.
13. Hadi A-M, Yilmaz B, McGlumphy E, Brantley W, Johnston WM. In vitro fit of CAD-CAM complete arch screw-retained titanium and zirconia implant prostheses fabricated on 4 implants. *J Prosthet Dent*. 2018;119(3):409–16.
14. Barbosa Jr SA, Bacchi A, Barão VAR, Silva-Sousa YTC, Bruniera JF, Caldas RA, et al. Implant volume loss, misfit, screw loosening, and stress in custom titanium and zirconia abutments. *Braz Dent J*. 2020;31:374–9.
15. Figueras-Alvarez O, Cantó-Navés O, Real-Voltas F, Roig M. Protocol for the clinical assessment of passive fit for multiple implant-supported prostheses: A dental technique. *J Prosthet Dent*. 2021;126(6):727–30.
16. Pan Y, Tsoi JKH, Lam WYH, Pow EHN. Implant framework misfit: A systematic review on assessment methods and clinical complications. *Clin Implant Dent Relat Res*. 2021;23(2):244–58.
17. Menini M, Setti P, Pera F, Pera P, Pesce P. Accuracy of multi-unit implant impression: traditional techniques versus a digital procedure. *Clin Oral Investig*. 2018;22(3):1253–62.
18. Lee SJ, Gallucci GO. Digital vs. conventional implant impressions: efficiency outcomes. *Clin Oral Implants Res*. 2013;24(1):111–5.
19. Pradies G, Ferreiroa A, Özcan M, Giménez B, Martínez-Rus F. Using stereophotogrammetric technology for obtaining intraoral digital impressions of implants. *J Am Dent Assoc*. 2014;145(4):338–44.
20. Bratos M, Bergin JM, Rubenstein JE, Sorensen JA. Effect of simulated intraoral variables on the accuracy of a photogrammetric imaging technique for complete-arch implant prostheses. *J*

- Prosthet Dent. 2018;120(2):232–41.
21. Bergin JM, Rubenstein JE, Mancl L, Brudvik JS, Raigrodski AJ. An in vitro comparison of photogrammetric and conventional complete-arch implant impression techniques. *J Prosthet Dent.* 2013;110(4):243–51.
 22. Anderson RW, McGarrah HE, Lamb RD, Eick JD. Root surface measurements of mandibular molars using stereophotogrammetry. *J Am Dent Assoc.* 1983;107(4):613–5.
 23. Lie A, Jemt T. Photogrammetric measurements of implant positions. Description of a technique to determine the fit between implants and superstructures. *Clin Oral Implants Res.* 1994;5(1):30–6.
 24. Örtorp A, Jemt T. CNC-milled titanium frameworks supported by implants in the edentulous jaw: a 10-year comparative clinical study. *Clin Implant Dent Relat Res.* 2012;14(1):88–99.
 25. Sallorenzo A, Gómez-Polo M. Comparative study of the accuracy of an implant intraoral scanner and that of a conventional intraoral scanner for complete-arch fixed dental prostheses. *J Prosthet Dent.* 2022;128(5):1009–16.
 26. Sánchez-Monescillo A, Hernanz-Martín J, González-Serrano C, González-Serrano J, Duarte Jr S. All-on-four rehabilitation using photogrammetric impression technique. *Quintessence Int.* 2019;50(4):288–93.
 27. Gómez-Polo M, Gómez-Polo C, Del Río J, Ortega R. Stereophotogrammetric impression making for polyoxymethylene, milled immediate partial fixed dental prostheses. *J Prosthet Dent.* 2018;119(4):506–10.
 28. Peñarrocha-Oltra D, Agustín-Panadero R, Bagán L, Giménez B, Peñarrocha M. Impression of multiple implants using photogrammetry: description of technique and case presentation. *Med Oral Patol Oral Cir Bucal.* 2014;19(4):e366.
 29. Peñarrocha-Diogo M, Balaguer-Martí JC, Peñarrocha-Oltra D, Balaguer-Martínez JF, Peñarrocha-Diogo M, Agustín-Panadero R. A combined digital and stereophotogrammetric technique for rehabilitation with immediate loading of complete-arch, implant-supported prostheses: a randomized controlled pilot clinical trial. *J Prosthet Dent.* 2017;118(5):596–603.
 30. Imetric4D. No Title. iCam 4D: The Revolution of Implantology. 2021. p. <https://www.imetric4d.com/products/icam-4d/>.
 31. Vandeweghe S, Vervack V, Dierens M, De Bruyn H. Accuracy of digital impressions of multiple dental implants: an in vitro study. *Clin Oral Implants Res.* 2017;28(6):648–53.
 32. Iturrate M, Eguiraun H, Solaberrieta E. Accuracy of digital impressions for implant-supported complete-arch prosthesis, using an auxiliary geometry part—An in vitro study. *Clin Oral Implants Res.* 2019;30(12):1250–8.
 33. Richi MW, Kurtulmus-Yilmaz S, Ozan O. Comparison of the accuracy of different impression procedures in case of multiple and angulated implants: Accuracy of impressions in multiple and angulated implants. *Head Face Med.* 2020;16(1):9.
 34. Stuari VT, Ferreira R, Manfredi GGP, Cardoso M V, Sant'Ana ACP. Photogrammetry as an alternative for acquiring digital dental models: A proof of concept. *Med Hypotheses.* 2019;128:43–9.
 35. Azevedo L, Molinero-Mourelle P, Antonaya-Martín JL, del Río-Highsmith J, Correia A, Gómez-Polo M. Photogrammetry technique for the 3D digital impression of multiple dental implants. In: *ECCOMAS Thematic Conference on Computational Vision and Medical Image Processing*. Springer; 2019. p. 615–9.
 36. Kosago P, Ungurawasaporn C, Kukiattrakoon B. Comparison of the accuracy between conventional and various digital implant impressions for an implant-supported mandibular complete arch-fixed prosthesis: An in vitro study. *J Prosthodont.* 2023;32(7):616–24.
 37. Ma B, Yue X, Sun Y, Peng L, Geng W. Accuracy of photogrammetry, intraoral scanning, and conventional impression techniques for complete-arch implant rehabilitation: an in vitro comparative study. *BMC Oral Health.* 2021;21(1):636.
 38. Flügge T, van der Meer WJ, Gonzalez BG, Vach K, Wismeijer D, Wang P. The accuracy of different dental impression techniques for implant-supported dental prostheses: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Clinical Oral Implants Research.* 2018.

39. Revilla-León M, Rubenstein J, Methani MM, Piedra-Cascón W, Özcan M, Att W. Trueness and precision of complete-arch photogrammetry implant scanning assessed with a coordinate-measuring machine. *J Prosthet Dent.* 2023;129(1):160–5.
40. Tohme H, Lawand G, Chmielewska M, Makhzoume J. Comparison between stereophotogrammetric, digital, and conventional impression techniques in implant-supported fixed complete arch prostheses: An in vitro study. *J Prosthet Dent.* 2023;129(2):354–62.
41. Moslemion M, Payaminia L, Jalali H, Alikhasi M. Do type and shape of scan bodies affect accuracy and time of digital implant impressions? *Eur J Prosthodont Restor Dent.* 2020;28(1):18–27.
42. Katsoulis J, Takeichi T, Sol Gaviria A, Peter L, Katsoulis K. Misfit of implant prostheses and its impact on clinical outcomes. Definition, assessment and a systematic review of the literature. *Eur J Oral Implant.* 2017;10(Suppl 1):121–38.